


Defendant Haynes also moves to strike certain discovery requests Plaintiff has served on Defendant Haynes. Specifically, Defendant Haynes requests that the Court strike a discovery request he received from the Plaintiff on August 26, 2019. Defendant Haynes claims Plaintiff has exceeded the limits set forth in Rule 33 of the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure. [Doc. 48 at 1-2]. Defendant Haynes also asks the Court to strike a set of requests for admissions that Plaintiff served on Defendant Haynes, but which purport to be directed to Defendant Sami Hassan [Doc. 48 at 2]. Defendant Haynes indicates in his motion that these discovery requests are attached as Exhibit 1. They are not.

The Court will deny Defendant Haynes' motion to strike. Regardless of whether these requests were provided for the Court's review, a motion to strike is not the proper means to address potentially improper discovery requests. Defendant Haynes is referred to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for guidance on this issue. The Court also notes for the parties' benefit that the Pretrial Order and Case Management Plan also addresses discovery limits in this case.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- (1) The Defendant's Motion [Doc. 47] is **GRANTED** and the deadlines set forth in the Pretrial Order and Case Management Plan [Doc. 36] in this case shall be extended by sixty (60) days.
- (2) The Defendant's Motion [Doc. 48] is **DENIED**.

Signed: September 6, 2019


Frank D. Whitney
Chief United States District Judge

